



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,214	08/29/2006	Tomoyuki Hasegawa	Q92149	2252
23373	7590	07/20/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			MOORE, SUSANNA	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/561,214	HASEGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SUSANNA MOORE	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7-9 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/19/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 4/22/2010, with respect to Office Action mailed 1/22/2010 have been fully considered. This is a Final Office Action. In summary, claims 1-9 and 24 are currently pending and under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/19/2005, is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being reconsidered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re*

Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 7-9 and 24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7034153. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the reasons provided below.

The instant Application is claiming 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate, simple compositions, a method of making the methanesulfonate salt and a method of antagonizing the CRF receptor with said salt.

Nakai et. al. is claiming 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine and pharmaceuticall acceptable salts

thereof, see claim 1, column 253. The methanesulfonate salt is taught in column 22, line 9. Nakai also teaches the intended use, see column 2, line 7. It is routine experimentation to make a methansulfonate salt of an amine compound. Furthermore, if the compound is obvious the method of making said compound is obvious. The fact that the crystalline property is being claimed of 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate, simple compositions, a method of making the methanesulfonate salt does not overcome the obviousness between the reference and the instant Application. Moreover, if the crystalline form of any compound is introduced into a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, which is a liquid, the crystallinity of the compound is lost. Thus, said claims are rendered obvious by Nakai et. al.

Applicant traversed the above rejection by stating, "At page 427, left column, lines 8-14 (abstract), Bastin et al. discloses that "the salt form selected will influence a range of other properties such as melting point, hygroscopicity, chemical stability, dissolution rate, solution pH, crystal form, and mechanical properties. Where possible, a range of salts should be prepared for each new substance and their properties compared during a suitable preformulation program." Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Bastin et al. acknowledges that selection of a suitable salt for each compound is an unpredictable process."

This is not found persuasive. This is not contrary to the Examiner's assertion, either. Of course the salt formed will affect other properties; this is still routine experimentation and obvious to try. Furthermore, the results of the instant Application are not unexpected. As mentioned in the previous office action, it is known in the art that mesylate salts produce higher melting point compounds, see Bastin et. al. (Organic Process & Development, 2000, 4, pages

427-435). Although this may not be seen for all compounds, as pointed out by Applicant, an organic chemist would choose the mesylate salt of the Nakai reference based on the Nakai and Basin reference and expect to produce a higher melting point compound. This is properly outlined above in the rejection and this is all that is required to render the instant Application obvious. Moreover, the mesylate salt is one of the most popular anionic salts which is FDA approved commercially, see Berge et. al. (*Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 1977, pages 1-19), see page 2, Table 1, right hand side. One of ordinary skill in the art would make the mesylate salt based on the Berge reference and expect a higher melting point compound, based on the Bastin reference.

Finally, in *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1348, 82 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2007) the case was directed to the amlodipine besylate drug product, which is commercially sold in tablet form in the United States under the trademark Norvasc®. At the time of the invention, amlodipine was known as was the use of besylate anions. Amlodipine was known to have the same therapeutic properties as were being claimed for the amlodipine besylate but Pfizer discovered that the besylate form had better manufacturing properties (e.g., reduced “stickiness”). Pfizer argued that the results of forming amlodipine besylate would have been unpredictable and therefore nonobvious. The court rejected the notion that unpredictability could be equated with nonobviousness here, because there were only a finite number (53) of pharmaceutically acceptable salts to be tested for improved properties. The court found that one of ordinary skill in the art having problems with the machinability of amlodipine would have looked to forming a salt of the compound and would have been able to narrow the group of potential salt-formers to a group of 53 anions known to form pharmaceutically acceptable salts,

which would be an acceptable number to form "a reasonable expectation of success."

Thus, the rejection is maintained.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSANNA MOORE whose telephone number is (571)272-9046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna Moore/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**